



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,042	02/17/2001	Mark Cecchetti	20-LC-2017/624226.299	6660

7590 03/03/2005

David G. Maire, Esquire  
Beusse, Brownlee, Bowdoin & Wolter, P.A.  
390 North Orange Avenue  
Suite 2500  
Orlando, FL 32801

EXAMINER

CHOI, PETER H


ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

 <b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/788,042	Applicant(s) CECCHETTI ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter Choi	Art Unit 3623	PC

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/17/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 2/17/01 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/17/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application); the disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

1. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. However, the provisional application upon which priority is claimed fails to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 1-14 of this application. There is a lack of support for the pending claims in the provisional (60/183,203) and parent applications (09/685,712). The provisional and parent applications disclose a system and method for conducting an online auction and tracking post auction activities; however, none of these priority applications addresses the specifics of how such activities are monitored and displayed as recited in the claims on the instant application. Therefore, the filing data of the instant application (February 17, 2001) has been recognized as its earliest granted priority data for purposes of applying prior art.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

Art Unit: 3623

2. The examiner has reviewed the patents supplied in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) provided on 2/17/01.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to because:

- In Figure 2:
  - The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "32" has been used to designate both Reserve Files and Select Buyer. However, in the specification, reference character "32" is designated to be ***Reserve Price***.
  - The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference character "38". According to the specification, reference character "38" is used to identify the buyer by phone number, a task that is supposed to be addressed by reference character "34". Instead, reference character "34" is used to identify the buyer by phone number.
  - The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: reference character "37". Reference character "37" identifies the buyer by e-mail address, a task that was assigned to reference character "40".

Art Unit: 3623

- The specification states that information in blocks 34,36,38 and 40 identify the buyer by name, phone number and e-mail. However, according to Figure 2, block **32** identifies the buyer by name, block **34** identifies the buyer by phone number and block **37** identifies the buyer by e-mail address.
- The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: reference character "36". The specification does not disclose a block for identifying the buyer by fax number.
- In Figure 7:
  - No reference is made to any element of the invention.
- In Figure 8:
  - The specification describes 7 columns of "work flow" blocks. However, only 6 columns are portrayed.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing

Art Unit: 3623

figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

In addition to Replacement Sheets containing the corrected drawing figure(s), applicant is required to submit a marked-up copy of each Replacement Sheet including annotations indicating the changes made to the previous version. The marked-up copy must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Marked-up Drawings" and must be presented in

the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing and marked-up copy will result in the abandonment of the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "the communications database" in line 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The applicant has failed to disclose a communications database. However, earlier in the claim, the applicant disclosed a communications network interconnecting a plurality of databases. For the purposes of the following art rejection, the examiner has substituted "communications database" for "communications network".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 3623

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. (US 2002/0087381 A1), in view of Primavera Expedition 7.0 as disclosed in "Primavera Introduces Primavera Expedition 7.0".

Regarding claim 1, Freeman et al. teaches a computer implemented method and system for tracking the work flow activities for a project comprising:

a display (electronic "Dashboard") responsive to a planned sequence of completion of the plurality of activities [Paragraph 19];

an indication (status location) of a party (subcontractor) responsible for each respective activity [Claim 1];

a status indication for each respective activity, the status indication being provided by a change in state of a visual (graphical) indicator associated with each respective activity on the web page [Paragraphs 20 and 21]; and

an indication of activities that remain to be completed (electronic "Dashboard" used to monitor the status of the project) for the completion of the project [Paragraph 19].



The status indicator of Freeman et al. alerts users of an activity status change (delays, no change, minor change, or major change). It is old and well known in the art that the completion of an activity can be defined as a status change, and should therefore be represented in the activity status indicator. Freeman et al. is silent regarding a listing of a plurality of activities related to a project on a web page. However, Primavera Expedition 7.0 teaches a web-based, computer implemented process for tracking the work flow activities for a project to communicate completion status of the project to a plurality of parties involved in the project, the method comprising:

- generating a plurality of activity management records (relevant project information) in a work flow management system [Paragraph 2] and;

- enabling the web page output to include on a single web page:

- a listing of a plurality of activities (relevant project information) associated with a project [Paragraph 2];

It is common knowledge that providing a visual display of the activities required by the project, the sequence in which they are to be performed, and the status of each activity of the project through a project web page would improve communication between project team members and provide them with a better understanding of their relationship to the entire project. Team members would know what to do without the conflicting demands of multiple project managers and functional managers who communicate different activities at different times. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings

Art Unit: 3623

of Freeman et al. by adding the listing of activities taught by Primavera Expedition 7.0 for the reasons discussed above therein.

The combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. are silent regarding a web page accessible to a plurality of users via a communications network. However, Primavera teaches that communications are performed via the web [Paragraph 8] and furthermore, it is inherent that a computer must be connected a communications network (such as a data processing network) in order to access the web page using the Internet.

Regarding claim 2, Freeman et al. teaches a visual indicator (status indicator) associated with each respective activity, and a display element (dashboard display that changes colors) positioned in such area indicative of a completion status of the activity [Paragraphs 20 and 21]. Freeman et al. also teaches that a portion of the dashboard is designated for each subcontractor.

Furthermore, although not explicitly taught by Freeman et al., it is common knowledge that the layout of a web page is at the discretion of the site administrator and programmer. It is a well-known design principle that it is logical to cluster relevant information together, such as the listing of project tasks and the completion status. It is common knowledge that the law of proximity states that elements close together will be perceived as belonging together. The well-known design principle of consistency would lead a web page designer to use consistent mappings (visual indicators and display

Art Unit: 3623

elements) and locations (important things should be placed in easily accessible and obvious places, such as the center of the screen, or the upper left side of the web site) throughout a website. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Freeman et al. to place elements in predetermined areas of a web page for the reasons discussed above therein.

8. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. in view of Primavera Expedition 7.0 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Webster for Primavera 2.1, as disclosed in WebArchive.

Regarding claim 3, the combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. are silent regarding hyperlinks on the single web page that direct the user to a second webpage containing information related to the project. However, Webster for Primavera 2.1 teaches at least one (embedded) hyperlink on the single web page directed to a second web page (or web sites of documents) containing information related to the project [Paragraph 11].

It is common knowledge that web page designers use hyperlinks to direct users to other web pages containing additional relevant information, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. to include hyperlinks to other web pages as taught by Webster for Primavera 2.1 since it would

Art Unit: 3623

allow users to quickly and efficiently view additional information related to the project that is necessary to the understanding and completion of their assigned tasks.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. in view of Primavera Expedition 7.0 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Primavera SureTrak Project Manager 2.0, as disclosed in WebArchive.

Regarding claim 4, the combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. are silent regarding a web page output that lists a plurality of activities associated with a plurality of associated projects. However, Primavera SureTrak Project Manager 2.0 provides a web page output (using the SureTrak Web Publishing Wizard) from the work flow management system including a listing of a plurality of activities (a PERT view that enables users to view the sequence of activities) associated with a plurality of associated projects on the single web page [Paragraph 3, Paragraph 2].

Furthermore, it is common knowledge that employees often work on several projects simultaneously. It is old and well known in the art that employees would benefit from a single listing of all assigned activities from projects they are working on, which would enable employees to prioritize activities by deadlines or urgency, identify and avoid schedule conflicts, and commence working on their next activity upon completion or unplanned delays (due to status changes). Therefore, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. to display a list of activities associated

Art Unit: 3623

with a plurality of projects on a single web page for the reasons discussed above therein.

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. in view of Primavera Expedition 7.0 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Primavera Expedition 6.3, as disclosed in WebArchive.

Regarding claim 5, the combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. are silent regarding a search engine function. However, Primavera Expedition 6.3 teaches a (Boolean) search engine function accessible to the plurality of users via the electronic network and selectively displaying information on the single web page web display in response to a user selected criteria [Paragraph 11].

Although not expressly apparent, it is likely that the features of Primavera Expedition 6.3 would be included in later versions of the Primavera Expedition software (including version 7.0). In addition, it is old and well known in the art that web pages can have search engines built-in. A well-known benefit of using search engines is that they can quickly search the Internet, Intranet, or the web site to find information (stored on the web site or somewhere else on the Internet) based on user queries. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. to include a search engine function, as taught by Primavera Expedition 6.3 to allow project members to

Art Unit: 3623

quickly gather relevant information pertaining to a project or project activities that they are working on.

11. Claims 6-8 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al.

Regarding claim 6, Freeman et al. teaches a computer implemented method and system for tracking the work flow activities for a project comprising:

- a listing of activities (embodied by an electronic "Dashboard") responsive to a planned sequence of completion of the plurality of activities [Paragraph 19];

- an indication (status location) of a party (subcontractor) responsible for each respective activity [Claim 1]; and

- a status indication for each respective activity, the status indication being provided by a change in state of a visual (graphical) indicator associated with each respective activity on the web page [Paragraphs 20 and 21];

It is old and well known in the art that a central server is required to host a web page and that a plurality of user interface devices (computers) are connected to that server using a communications network in means that are well-established in the art. In a web-based system, the presence of a network is inherently needed to enable users to remotely view the web page being hosted by the server. Logic residents used to produce web displays accessible by a plurality of user interface devices (computers) are

also old and well known in the art. Since the system taught by Freeman is accessible via the Internet [Claim 3], these features are deemed to be inherent.

Regarding claim 7, Freeman et al. teaches the web based tracking system of claim 6, wherein the change in state of a visual (graphical) indicator of completion status comprises a display element (status indicator "click box" and color of the Dashboard display) [Paragraphs 20 and 21].

Furthermore, although not explicitly taught by Freeman et al., it is common knowledge that the layout of a web page is at the discretion of the site administrator and programmer. It is a well-known design principle that it is logical to cluster relevant information together, such as the listing of project tasks and the completion status. It is common knowledge that the law of proximity states that elements close together will be perceived as belonging together. The well-known design principle of consistency would lead a web page designer to use consistent mappings (visual indicators and display elements) and locations (important things should be placed in easily accessible and obvious places, such as the center of the screen, or the upper left side of the web site) throughout a website. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Freeman et al. to place elements in predetermined areas of a web page for the reasons discussed above therein.

Regarding claim 8, Freeman et al. teaches the web based tracking system of claim 6, further comprising an indication on the single web page of activities that remain

Art Unit: 3623

to be completed (embodied as an electronic "Dashboard" used to monitor the status of the project) for the completion of a project [Paragraph 19].

Regarding claim 11, Freeman et al. teaches a computer implemented method and system for tracking the work flow activities for a project comprising:

a listing of activities (embodied by an electronic "Dashboard") responsive to a planned sequence of completion of the plurality of activities [Paragraph 19];

an indication (status location) of a party (subcontractor) responsible for each activity [Claim 1]; and

an indication of activities (status indicator "click box" and color of the electronic "Dashboard" used to monitor the status of the project) that remain to be completed for the completion of the project [Paragraphs 19, 20, and 21].

It is old and well known in the art that vendors maintain databases containing information about the customers, items for sale and bid/sale price. It is common knowledge that electronic auction sites (such as eBay) maintain records of every auction they host for record keeping. It is old and well known in the art that in an auction, information regarding the buyers, suppliers, items for sale, and bid history are needed to complete the sale of goods after the auction is completed. It is common knowledge that after the auction, the winning bidder (buyer) and supplier are paired together and the described items are sold at the winning bid price, information that is all stored either in a single database or separate databases. Multiple databases may be



Art Unit: 3623

located on the same computer, or on different computers connected through a communications network (or similar means), where means of accessing this information is old and well known in the art. Data can also be entered into a database using known input devices (keyboards, mice, diskettes, compact discs, etc.) that are old and well known in the art.

Electronic auction sites such as eBay are third-party facilitators of trade, and are not themselves responsible for the sequence of events required to complete the auction. These sites are electronic marketplaces, but do not actively participate in the transaction between buyer and seller. As the medium through which both the bidder and seller participated in the auction, electronic auction sites act as intermediaries and offer the services of third parties that can provide authentication, insurance, and escrow for transactions. eBay provides both the participants a list of activities needed to complete the sale of items being auctioned. Both the buyer and seller are notified of their responsibilities (sending payment, shipping of the goods, etc.) and both parties can monitor the status of these tasks.

It is old and well known in the art that a central server is required to host the web site of online auctions and that a plurality of user interface devices (computers) are connected to that server using a communications network in means that are well-established in the art. In a web-based system, the presence of a network is inherently needed to enable users to remotely view the web page being hosted by the server. Logic residents used to produce web displays accessible by a plurality of user interface

devices (computers) are also old and well known in the art. Since the system taught by Freeman is accessible via the Internet [Claim 3], these features are deemed to be inherent.

Regarding claim 12, Freeman et al. teaches the system of claim 11, wherein the display further comprises:

a display (electronic "Dashboard") responsive to a planned sequence of completion of the plurality of activities [Paragraph 19]; and

a display element (status indicator "click box") having a state representative (color of the electronic "Dashboard" used to monitor the status of the project) of the completion status of the respective activity [Paragraphs 19, 20, and 21].

Furthermore, although not explicitly taught by Freeman et al., it is common knowledge that the layout of a web page is at the discretion of the site administrator and programmer. It is a well-known design principle that it is logical to cluster relevant information together, such as the listing of project tasks in sequential order and their completion status. It is common knowledge that the law of proximity states that elements close together will be perceived as belonging together. The well-known design principle of consistency would lead a web page designer to use consistent mappings (visual indicators and display elements) and locations (important things should be placed in easily accessible and obvious places, such as the center of the screen, or the upper left side of the web site) throughout a website. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Freeman et al. to

Art Unit: 3623

place elements in predetermined areas of a web page for the reasons discussed above therein.

Regarding claim 13, Freeman et al. is silent regarding a listing of activities necessary to complete a sale. However, it is common knowledge that a series of activities must be completed in any sale of goods. In a sales transaction between two parties, it is inherent that the seller needs to provide the buyer a contract of sale (sales draft, receipt, etc.), ship and deliver the item. The buyer is inherently responsible for paying the seller the agreed upon amount and to accept delivery of the item. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Freeman et al. to include a list of activities inherently necessary to complete a sale.

Regarding claim 14, Freeman et al. is silent regarding hyperlinks to a purchase order form. However, it is old and well known in the art that hyperlinks are used to direct users to other web pages containing related information. It is common knowledge that hyperlinks can be used to direct users to the web site of other parties involved in the transaction, to detailed information about the transaction (its status, description of tasks to be completed, description of tasks already completed, etc.) or to a purchase order form to facilitate the sale of goods. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Freeman et al. to include a hyperlink to a purchase order form needed to complete a sale.

Art Unit: 3623

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Webster for Primavera 2.1, as disclosed in WebArchive.

Regarding claim 9, Freeman et al. fails to teach a hyperlink that directs a user to a second web page containing information related to a project. However, Webster for Primavera 2.1 teaches at least one (embedded) hyperlink on the single web page directed to a second web page (or web sites of documents) containing information related to the at least one project [Paragraph 11].

Furthermore, it is common knowledge that web page designers use hyperlinks to direct users to other web pages containing additional relevant information. It is old and well known in the art that hyperlinks can be used to direct users (and project team members) to the web site of other parties involved in the project, or to view detailed information about the project (its status, description of tasks to be completed, description of tasks already completed, etc.) on a separate web page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. to include hyperlinks to other web pages since it would allow users to quickly and efficiently view additional information related to the project that is necessary to the understanding and completion of their assigned tasks.

13. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Primavera Expedition 6.3, as disclosed by WebArchive.

Regarding claim 10, Freeman et al. is silent regarding a search capability resident on the server for manipulating the single web page display in response to a user selected criteria. However, Primavera Expedition 6.3 teaches a (Boolean) search capability resident [Paragraph 11] on the server for manipulating the single web page web display in response to a user selected criteria.

Although not expressly apparent, it is likely that the features of Primavera Expedition 6.3 would be included in later versions of the Primavera Expedition software (including version 7.0). In addition, it is old and well known in the art that web pages can have search engines built-in. A well-known benefit of using search engines is that they can quickly search the Internet, Intranet, or the web site to find information (stored on the web site or somewhere else on the Internet) based on user queries. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combined teachings of Primavera Expedition 7.0 and Freeman et al. to include a search engine function, as taught by Primavera Expedition 6.3 to allow project members to quickly gather relevant information pertaining to a project or project activities that they are working on.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 3623

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Saito et al. (U.S Patent #6,578,006) teaches a project work management system and method that manages a project executed by individuals or groups belonging to an organization. The method comprises the steps of defining tasks for each phase, and preparing a work management table for managing work progress, and a task management unit for providing program means for storing the tasks or a task status of a project. The task management unit creates a task definition table for defining task start and end conditions, and describes the task which the user may perform in that project phase.

Gottzman et al. (U.S Patent #6,134,548) teaches a system, method and article of manufacture for using a mobile device to shop for goods. The mobile unit is used to query the web (using a search engine) to find price, shipping and availability information on the product from various web suppliers. The mobile unit can then be used to place an order interactively. The mobile unit is connected to a network that enables it to browse the web. The system has a logic associated with creating a customized, "user-centric", content web page for each user.

Primavera's SureTrak Project Manager 2.0 teaches a project management software that includes a web publishing wizard that automates the creation and maintenance of project web pages that are accessible through any browser.

David Porubek's "Software Helps Project Managers Organize Time, Human Resources, and Communications" discloses how computer software can aid project managers manage employee workload and communicate project goals and timelines effectively to the members of their project teams. Porubek teaches the usefulness of graphical timelines accompanied by written descriptions of the task name, duration, and start and end date. Porubek also teaches that web sites include both static (historical information, team goals and deliverables, etc) and dynamic content (timelines, status reports, etc) and that timely updates to dynamic information on web sites ensure its relevance and usefulness to team members.

Bill Burchard's "ProjectPoint supports project collaboration" teaches a software by buzzsaw.com, ProjectPoint, that tracks who performs certain activities. ProjectPoint also lets users browse a project's contents using an Internet web browser. ProjectPoint uses a remote web server to store a variety of electronic project files.

Jeff Angus' "Project planner that sees people as individuals" teaches Enterprise Project 2, a project planning system from eLabor.com Inc. that lets planners coordinate multiple projects, managing them as a portfolio of efforts. Planners can sort people by skill and allocate them to project teams.

Art Unit: 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Choi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0852. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PC

February 2, 2005

*Susanna M. Diaz*  
SUSANNA M. DIAZ  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*AU 3623*